

REMARKS

Claims 7-8 have been canceled. Claims 1-6 remain pending in the application.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,151,334 to Kim et al.; claims 3-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,504,855 to Matsunaga; claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,874,048 to Knapp et al.; and claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,721,295 to Brown. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The Examiner maintained these rejections, again, by arguing that Kim et al. allegedly describe “bidirectional” communication between embedding unit 22 and removing unit 24—and, thus, allegedly disclose the claimed features of an extracting part (equated by the Examiner to the demultiplexor 74 in removing unit 24 described in Kim et al.) outputting data signals to a multiplexing circuit (equated by the Examiner to the multiplexor 48 in embedding unit 22 described in Kim et al.). Page 2, paragraph 2 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully point out to the Examiner that the newly-cited portion of Kim et al. (col. 19, lines 34-45) merely includes description of “multiple embedding units and removing units”—as illustrated in Figs. 18A and 18B of Kim et al., with the separate unidirectional assemblies illustrated therein—for respective unidirectional communications from “embedding units” to “removing units” in opposite directions that collectively form the so-called “bidirectional” communications. And Applicants reiterate that Figs. 18A and 18B, which are still referred to in this new portion of Kim et al., merely illustrate unidirectional communications from the “embedding units” to “removing units” in opposite directions to, thus, form the “bidirectional” communications, and do not illustrate the demultiplexor 74 extracting any

information for outputting to and for the use in the multiplexing performed by multiplexor 48, as alleged by the Examiner in supporting the claim rejections.

Therefore, Applicants, once again, remind the Examiner that “[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim...” MPEP § 2131 (citing In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990)). And Applicants have previously pointed out that the elements described in Kim et al. that were relied upon in the claim rejections were not arranged in the manner recited in the claims, and therefore, fail to disclose the claimed invention. Again, the Examiner relied upon the description of demultiplexor 74 in removing unit 24 of Kim et al. as alleged disclosure of the claimed extracting part. Kim et al. only describe, however, multiplexor 48 sending a signal to the removing unit 24, and do not disclose the multiplexor 48 receiving any signal from the removing unit 24, as further clarified above with respect to Figs. 18A and 18B of Kim et al. Therefore, Kim et al., as cited and relied upon by the Examiner, at least fail to disclose the claimed features of the extracting part outputting data signals to the multiplexing circuit.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Kim et al. only describe a scheduler 46 receiving outputs from a data buffer 42 to receive “encoded words” and controlling the signals output *by* the multiplexor according to rules in terms of the contents of the received “encoded words.” Please see, e.g., col. 7, line 56 to col. 8, line 28 of Kim et al.

In other words, Kim et al., as cited and relied upon by the Examiner, fail to disclose,

“[a] device for processing data signals, comprising:
a plurality of input interfaces each receiving an input
signal; and
a multiplexing circuit multiplexing a plurality of output
signals from the plurality of input interfaces,
wherein said each of the plurality of input interfaces
comprises:
a storing part storing the input signal; and
an extracting part extracting data signals
included in said input signal from said storing part and
outputting said data signals to said multiplexing circuit,

wherein said extracting part receives storage state information indicating an amount of data stored in said storing part from said storing part and outputs said data signals to said multiplexing circuit based on the amount of data indicated by the storage state information,” as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added)

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Kim et al. for at least the above-stated reasons. The Examiner relied upon the additional references to specifically address the features recited in the dependent claims. As such, the additions of these references would still have failed to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Kim et al. even assuming, arguendo, that such additions would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the claimed invention was made. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-6 are patentable over the cited references, separately and in combination, for at least the foregoing reasons.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dexter T. Chang/
Dexter T. Chang
Reg. No. 44,071

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Telephone: (212) 940-6384
Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987
Docket No.: FUJI 19,420 (100794-00176)
DTC:kc